

13th November 1922]

- (f) No. It was not a matter that would ordinarily be brought to the notice of Government, but the Government have now, for the benefit of the hon. Member, obtained a report of the facts from the District Magistrate.
- (g) No. The Government see no need for any inquiry.
- (h) The District Medical Officer had no concern with any warrant for arrest and was unaware that it had been issued. He admitted the patient, because he was ill.
- (i) Seeing that no convicted prisoner escaped from custody, the question does not arise.

*The Public Prosecutor of Masulipatam.*

327 Q.—S. R. Y. ANKINEDU PRASAD Bahadur: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

- (a) whether the public prosecutor of Masulipatam is appearing on behalf of the Government in the criminal appeal filed in the District Court of Kistna by the convicted Butchayya and others, against the judgment of the Gudivada Divisional Magistrate;
- (b) whether the same public prosecutor is also appearing for Butchayya and his father-in-law in certain civil suits pending in the same Court;
- (c) whether the rules, if in existence, will allow such an arrangement; and
- (d) whether the Government are satisfied that justice will not suffer if the same vakil appears for and against the accused in the same Court, though the cases are different?

A.—(a) & (b) The Government have no information.  
 (c) There are no rules to the contrary.  
 (d) The Government cannot answer an abstract question.

*Public prosecutors in the Presidency.*

328 Q.—Mr. M. APPALANARASAYYA NAYUDU: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state, in continuation of question No. 1248 by Munshi Muhammad Rahman Sahib at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 14th February 1922, the names of all the public prosecutors in the Presidency with the following information:—

- (a) age,
- (b) dates on which they were first appointed,
- (c) whether the rule requiring officers to be retired at the age of 55 or 60 years will apply to these officers,
- (d) whether, while the term of office is limited to three years at a time, the same individual can be appointed indefinitely any number of times; and
- (e) what was the scale of fees allowed formerly and now, and whether reduction of public prosecutors' fees was one of the items to be taken into consideration in the retrenchment scheme?

A.—(a) & (b) The hon. Member is referred to the "List of Establishments of the Judicial Department." The Government have no other information.  
 (c) No.  
 (d) Yes: if they are best fitted for the post.

[13th November 1922

(e) For the old and present scales of fees to public prosecutors the hon. Member is referred to G.O. No 450, dated 1st March 1921, placed on the table.\*

*Supply channel to the Periyakulam tank.*

329 Q.—Mr. R. APPASWAMI NAYUDU: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) with reference to the answer to question No. 39, dated 15th July 1920, whether as a result of the gauging operations in Araikulam odai in 1920, 1921 and in previous years it has been ascertained that sufficient water is available in the said odai; and

(b) if the reply to (a) be in the affirmative, when the preparation of the estimate and the sanction of the scheme for excavating a supply channel to the Periyakulam tank in Ottapidaram, Tinnevelly district, is expected to be completed?

A.—(a) & (b) The results of the gaugings taken have been received from the Superintending Engineer. The question whether a sufficient supply of water can be counted upon as being available in the odai is now under the consideration of the Chief Engineer for Irrigation.

*Irrigation of high lands in Tentiruperai, Tinnevelly district.*

330 Q.—Mr. R. APPASWAMI NAYUDU: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to lay on the table—

(a) a copy of the correspondence sanctioning the irrigation of high lands in Tentiruperai, Tiruchendur taluk of Tinnevelly district, from a new channel to be excavated from Tenkarai in Alvartirunagari, Tinnevelly district, instead of from the southern channel of the Srivaikuntam anicut with a view to improve the supply of water to the tank in Atur, Tiruchendur taluk of the Tinnevelly district; and

(b) a copy of the report of the Executive Engineer, Public Works Department, Palamcottah, made in 1920-21, recommending not to give effect to the above proposal and suggesting another remedy and copy of the order passed thereon by the Government?

A.—(a) & (b) No proposal for a new channel from the Tenkarai tank has been sanctioned.

*Drainage of wet lands under Perungulam tank in Tinnevelly district.*

331 Q.—Mr. R. APPASWAMI NAYUDU: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state with reference to answer to question No. 40, dated 13th July 1920, whether the Government have passed orders undertaking to improve the drainage of the wet lands under Perungulam tank in Srivaikuntam taluk of the Tinnevelly district at the expense of the Government and if so, when this work will be taken in hand?

A.—The Government have since sanctioned the execution of the work entirely from irrigation funds; it is proposed to put the work in hand during the closure.